DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 633 24 EA 002 862

AUTHOR Matthews, Ralph W., Ed.
TITLE Follow-up Study To Assess Curriculum Development Institute and Evaluate Guide to Curriculum Development. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Univ., Corvallis.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-1-076
PUB DATE Dec 69
GRANT OEG-9-8-081076-013130(010)
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.60
DESCRIPTORS Control Groups, *Curriculum Development, *Curriculum Guides, Data Analysis, *Evaluation, Higher Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), Questionnaires, Secondary Education, State Supervisors, Supervisors, *Vocational Education, Vocational Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

To evaluate the effectiveness and extent of use of a vocational curriculum development guide prepared by the institute's participants, questionnaires and interview data were obtained and analyzed in 1969 from four sources: (1) the original participants (19 vocational educators), (2) their supervisors, (3) 35 State Directors of Vocational Education, and (4) a control group of 33 nonparticipants . Data analysis confirmed that institute participants were generally more effective as change agents than nonparticipants holding comparable positions in vocational education. The guide was used in secondary curriculum planning as well as in instructing others on the participants' staffs. Participants used the institute-prepared guide much more than nonparticipants used self-developed or other available guides. Also, with respect to curriculum development, participants were more effective than the control group in reaching State vocational associations, teacher training units at the university level, inservice teacher training projects, staff training programs, administrators, and research coordinating units. (JK)

ED0 396333

BR 8-I-076
PA 24
EA

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-I-076
Grant No. Ore-9-8-081076-013130(010)

FOLLOW-UP STUDY TO ASSESS CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE AND EVALUATE GUIDE TO CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Henry A. Ten Pas
Hugh F. Jeffrey, Jr., Business Manager
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

December 1969

EA 002 862

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ED039633

Final Report

Project No. 8-I-076
Grant No. Ore-9-8-081076-013130(010)

Dr. Henry A. Ten Pas, Principal Investigator
Ralph W. Matthews - Editor

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331
December, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

In the month of July 1967, thirty vocational educators holding positions of leadership were selected to attend and participate in a Summer Institute for the Preparation of Vocational Educators in Curriculum Development. This institute, part of the on going program sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, had as its major purpose the promotion of innovative curriculum development procedures for vocational education; and the construction of a guide, complete with model, from which participants in the Institute and hopefully others could work for change and improvement in vocational education program curriculum.

Participants were selected from twenty-one states and Washington, D.C. Fifteen states sent a single representative, six sent two or more. Four participants were the most from any single state.

This report is a post-test evaluation of the 1967 Institute. The purpose is to determine the effectiveness of the Institute's guide and the extent of the participant's use of the guide in his efforts in curriculum development.

Recognition must be given to Dr. J. Kenneth Little, University of Wisconsin, for his assistance in developing the survey instruments used. His experience and calm judgment contributed much to keeping the instruments clearly to the point, and his generous expenditure of time in making reviews of the progress in developing the survey instruments indicates his dedication to the purposes of vocational education.

Ralph W. Matthews
Editor

FORWARD

There is every reason to believe that those who occupy positions of leadership in the development of curriculum for vocational education should be given the best tools it is possible to provide.

Institutes for the preparation of vocational educators to function most effectively in their leadership positions, must devise ways to most efficiently promote innovations in curriculum development to enable the institute participants to clearly determine the value of the use of the innovative procedures in their work.

The 30 participants in the 1967 Institute held at Oregon State University shared in discussions of how innovative procedures could bring about change and improvement in the development of curriculum for vocational education. The participants in the institute also shared in the construction of a curriculum development guide which contained a model from which individual program curriculum could be constructed. Thus, the Institute fulfilled its objectives to promote behavioral change on the part of the participants by presenting sound reasons for innovations in curriculum and providing a model and guide through which promotion of good, sound curriculum practices could be put into operation to improve vocational education in the schools of our Nation.

Thanks are due those many persons who replied to the questionnaires sent them on this post-test of the 1967 Institute for curriculum development. It is pleasing to find that the Institute has had a beneficial effect. This post-test gives Oregon State University an opportunity to look for even more effective ways to present materials and information in future institutes.

Our purpose, collectively as educators at any level of vocational education, is to make available the best possible vocational education program we can establish for out students. From a study of the questionnaires used in this post-test, it is obvious that the respondents are dedicated to the accomplishment of this goal.

Henry A. Ten Pas
Project Director

SUMMARY

This is the final post-test report on the SUMMER INSTITUTE TO PREPARE VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT which was conducted at Oregon State University during July, 1967.

The Institute was intended to equip individuals holding leadership positions in vocational education with the practical skills involved in making a curriculum guide and using it in their respective spheres of influence to effect change in vocational education curriculum development.

This follow-up project focused upon gathering data from four sources including: The participants in the original institute; State Directors of Vocational Education; the participant's immediate supervisor and; non-participants with an educational background of positions similar to those held by the Institute participants.

Information was gathered by mailed questionnaires, which were sent to members of each of the four groups listed above, to determine the actual functioning effect of the guide which was produced at the Institute as well as to determine information concerning curriculum guide structure and usage in states that were not involved in the Oregon State University Institute.

The follow-up study attempts to discover, by comparing Institute participants and controls, if the Institute was effective in helping participants become change agents who could proficiently use a research model of curriculum development. It also considers the selection factors for participation in curriculum development institutes. Through feedback, the study evaluates the success of the curriculum development guide developed by the Institute in promoting the ideas contained in it. Finally, the study considers the instructional content of the Institute and discusses possibilities for future efforts.

Results of the study show that the Oregon State University Institute was successful and that participants were generally more effective as change agents using the model developed at the Institute than were those from non-participating states who hold comparable positions in vocational education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . . Page 1

Methods 3

Results 7

Part 1 Participants and Their Supervisors 9

Part 2 Participants and Controls 15

Part 3 All Participants and Control Respondents 22

Part 4 State Directors of Vocational Education and Respondents 29

Part 5 Personal Interview with State Directors 35

Conclusions 38

Recommendations 40

Appendix 41

Letter to Non-Participant 42

Non-Participant Questionnaire 43

Letter to State Directors of Vocational Education 47

State Director-Vocational Education Questionnaire 48

Letter to Participant 51

Participant Questionnaire 52

Letter to Supervisor of Participant 57

Supervisor of Participant Questionnaire 58

References 62

Bibliography 63

TABLES

Table 1 Summary of Questionnaire Returns . . . . . Page 8

Table 2 Participant and Supervisor Estimate of Participant's Responsibility 10

Table 3 Used Guide to 11

Table 4 Guide Used With Listed Groups 11

Table 5 How do you rate the Institute and Guide in 13

Table 6 Participant and Supervisor Estimate of Participant's use of Institute 14

Table 7 Participant and Non-Participant States 15

Table 8 Participant and Control Resposibility Comparison 16

Table 9 Guides Were Produced by Participants and Controls . . . 18

Table 10 Extent you Used Guide for the Purposes Mentioned 19

Table 11 Did you Explain your Guide to 19

Table 12 Participants and Controls Estimate of Meetings and Attendance 21

Table 13 Curriculum Development Responsibility 23

Table 14 Guide Use for Meetings With. 23

Table 15 Guide Used to 25

Table 16 Groups Control and Participant Explained Guides to . . . 26

Table 17 How do you Rate your Guide in 27

Table 18 Responsibility of Agencies or persons to Develop Curriculum 32

Table 19 Changes since Passage of Vocational Education Act . . . 33

Table 20 Extent of Changes 34

Table 21 Observed Changes after Attending Institute 34

INTRODUCTION

1. What the report is about:

   This is a report on a long range follow-up to evaluate the amount of change that occured in vocational curriculum development as a result of an institute held during July 1967 and to establish usage of a guide for curriculum development which was developed as a result of the institute. The specific institute was: Summer Institute to Prepare Vocational Educators in Curriculum Development, Project Number 7-0497, Grant No. OEG 4-7-07-497-3143.

2. Description of the scope of the research:

   The scope of this study is (1) a follow-up to assess the use made of the Guide to Curriculum Development by those persons who were participants at the Curriculum Development Institute, (2) and to ascertain the change-agent role of the participants themselves.

3. Statement of hypothesis:

   The results of a long range follow-up, to the previously conducted institute for the training of vocational educators in the area of curriculum development, would be significant in reporting the actual success of the trainees for the purpose of helping to form guidelines for the goals and subject matter of future institutes.

4. The limits of the research:

   The primary parameter of the research was the discovery of whether the participants in the Oregon State University Institute had been able to use the guide developed by the Institute successfully in their efforts to effect change in the development of curriculum for vocational education in their sphere of influence and how their efforts and success in the use of the guide compared to that of persons in comparable positions who had not attended the O.S.U. Institute.

   Actual research activities began in February 1969 and ended in November 1969.

5. Significance:

a. Need: For experimentally-controlled follow-up studies in order to determine long-range effectiveness of an institute and related training programs. Specifically, this follow-up involves participants of the four-week training program in curriculum development in Vocational Education held at Oregon State University during the summer 1967.

b. Contribution: The results will be of significance to develop further institutes or related training programs by providing data on variables which contribute to effective short-term training. Educators concerned with developing and implementing broad-based curriculum in relation to social, economic, and psychological factors of the technical society and industrial-urban culture.

c. Significance: The anticipated findings from this project can eventuate in a revised Guide for Curriculum Development which can be a prototype for implementing the organic curriculum concept and a research model of curriculum development in vocational-technical education.

6. Objectives of the investigation:

Objectives as stated—

(1) To determine through comparison of trainees and controls the extent to which the institute program was effective in training individuals to be change agents in vocational-education curriculum development.

(2) To determine by comparing trainees and controls the extent to which the institute program was effective in training participants so they would be proficient in using a research model of vocational education curriculum development.

(3) To determine relative emphasis and comparative effectiveness of types of instructional content and learning experiences, and trainee selection factors in terms of efficient preparation of change agents in vocational technical curriculum development.

(4) To make thorough, planned, controlled feedback from trainees, consultants, and specialists.

METHODS

1. How the research was carried out:

   a. Letters were mailed to all participants in the Oregon State University Institute as advance notice that a study was being conducted upon the effectiveness of the Institute.

   b. Letters of explanation and a questionnaire were mailed to persons in the following groups:
      (1) State Directors of Vocational Education
      (2) Participants in the Institute
      (3) A control group
      (4) The supervisors of the Institute participants

   c. A tally was made and percentage comparisons were developed for analysis as follows:
      (1) Comparing samples of replies from selected participants with those of their immediate supervisors to determine if the supervisors held reasonable agreement to the statements made by the participants.
      (2) Comparing the replies to questionnaires from Institute participants from selected states with replies from controls in states from which no participants had been selected for the Institute. The states were selected on the basis of geographic proximity or population similarities.
      (3) Comparing replies from all respondents to questionnaires from the participant and control groups.
      (4) Determining the reply tally to selected questions from the State Directors of Vocational Education for comparison with selected questions asked of the participants and controls.

   d. Interviews with 9 State Directors of Vocational Education on a selected basis to obtain their views on both the Institute and to gain their suggestions for future curriculum development institutes.

2. Forms for the collection of the data were developed with the cooperation of Dr. J. Kenneth Little, University of Wisconsin.

3. Description of experimental and control groups:

   a. All persons were vocational educators meeting Institute selection requirements and criteria. The criteria dealt with the following:

Experimental Group
(Institute Participants)

(1) Extent to which applicant's position would permit him to assume leadership for vocational education curriculum development.
(2) Extent to which applicant was involved with vocational education curriculum development in high schools, post high schools, municipal or state departments, or universities.
(3) Extent to which applicant was committed or required to try out methods, materials, and techniques of curriculum development.
(4) Extent to which applicant had professional objectives and background of leader, innovator or change agent.

Control Group
(Non-Participants)

(1) Persons selected for the control group were known to have the same characteristics as the experimental group since they met the criteria for selection as participants in the Institute, but had not been selected. Some members of the control group represented states from which no participants for the Institute had been selected.

4. Methods of analysis:

   a. Analysis was made on the basis of percentage comparison as indicated item #1.c on the previous page to determine relationships between quantity and quality of vocational education curriculum development based on conditions of:
   (1) Institute v.s. non-institute training.
   (2) Position of trainees
   (3) Rating of respective guides
   (4) Use of the guide in various group discussions
   (5) Overall use of the guide—or individual success as a change agent
   (6) List of comments of the participants concerning the strengths and weakness of the program.

b. Comparison between the statistics involving the actual participants in the 1967 Oregon State University Institute and the check-up statistics on actual impact of the Institute given by the supervisors of these participants provided:
   (1) Degree of agreement on the title or position of the participant in the institute
   (2) Degree of agreement on areas of responsibility
   (3) Agreement on the extent to which the participant used the guide in actual practice
   (4) Agreement as to the participant's efforts for change on the following groups:
      - American Vocational Association
      - State Vocational Education Association
      - Teacher training (University)
      - Teacher convention
      - In-service training
      - Staff training
      - Research Coordinating Unit Personnel
      - Workshops
      - Advisory groups
      - Service groups
      - Student groups
      - Administration
      - School boards

c. Comparisons between program strength and recent activity in curriculum development showed:
   (1) Distribution of authority and responsibility
   (2) Whether or not individual had ever actually participated in the development of a curriculum guide
   (3) The over-all extent to which the guide was used
   (4) The extent of broad group discussion pertaining to the new guide and to areas it was spread in analyzing the extent to which the participant succeeded as a change agent
   (5) The rating of the guide and/or materials, how and to what extent it was used
   (6) Opinion on attending another institute
   (7) Of the non-participation states, the percent who had previously attended another such or similar institute
   (8) Comparing the comments of the supervisors with the statistical findings
   (9) Compare the given suggested topics for any future institute of the participating states and those given by the non-participating states

d. Interviews with State Directors were used to gain their opinions on the value of institutes for curriculum development and to obtain their suggestions for future efforts.

RESULTS

The analysis of the data was done in five parts to determine percentage comparisons between groups questioned. The list of groups compared are:

Part 1 Participants in the Oregon State University Institute and their immediate supervisors.

Part 2 Participants and controls. The controls were selected from states which had not had a participant in the Oregon State University Institute.

Part 3 All Participants and Control group respondents.

Part 4 State Directors of Vocational Education compared to all respondents in certain areas of concern.

Part 5 Personal interview of State Directors of Vocational Education.

Examples of the letters and questionnaires sent to the groups sampled can be found in the appendix beginning on page 42.

Table 1, page 8 shows the returns of questionnaires.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS											
*Personal Interview STATE	NO.PART.	PART.REPLY	CONTROL	PART.SUPER.	STATE DIR.	STATE	NO.PART.	PART.REPLY	CONTROL	PART.SUPER.	STATE DIR.
Alabama	0	0	0	0	1	Nevada	1	1	1	1	0
Alaska	1	0	0	0	1	New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	1
Arizona	1	1	1	1	1	New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	New Mexico	0	0	2	0	1*
California	4	2	1	1	0*	New York	0	0	0	0	1
Colorado	0	0	2	0	1*	North Carolina	1	1	0	0	1
Connecticut	1	1	0	1	1	North Dakota	0	0	1	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	1	Ohio	0	0	0	0	1
Florida	0	0	0	0	1	Oklahoma	2	2	0	2	1
Georgia	0	0	0	0	1	Oregon	2	2	3	1	0
Hawaii	3	1	1	2	1	Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0*
Idaho	1	1	9	1	0*	Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	1
Illinois	1	1	0	0	0*	South Carolina	0	0	0	0	1
Indiana	0	0	0	0	0	South Dakota	0	0	1	0	0
Iowa	0	0	0	0	1*	Tennessee	0	0	0	0	0*
Kansas	1	1	1	1	1	Texas	1	1	2	0	1
Kentucky	1	1	0	1	0	Utah	1	1	0	0	1
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	1	Vermont	0	0	0	0	1
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	Virginia	0	0	0	0	1
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	Washington	2	0	3	2	1
Massachusetts	1	1	0	0	0	West Virginia	0	0	0	0	1
Michigan	1	0	0	0	1	Wisconsin	2	1	1	2	1
Minnesota	0	0	1	0	1	Wyoming	1	0	0	0	1
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	1	Washington D.C.	1	0	0	0	1
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	1
Montana	0	0	2	0	0	Guam	0	0	0	0	1
Nebraska	0	0	1	0	1*	TOTALS:	30	19	33	16	35

RESULTS

PART 1

COMPARISON OF DATA FROM NINE PARTICIPANTS IN THE OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY SUMMER 1967 SEUMMER INSTITUTE FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND THEIR SUPERVISORS.

Of the nineteen participant questionnaires returned, only nine could be matched with questionnaires returned from their immediate supervisors satisfactorily for this study.

Questions were asked of the two groups in such a way that the participant replied concerning himself and the supervisor replied as to his perception of the activities and success of the participant in using the Institute's guide in his curriculum development work.

Table 2, page 10, shows the amount of curriculum development responsibility the participant said he had toward certain listed educational agencies and whether that responsibility was advisory or direct (defined as legal or by regulation). The same table shows the replies from the participant's supervisor on the same question.

It is apparent from the replies from both groups that the participants do in fact have responsibility for curriculum development and the agreement as to its distribution to the named agencies was very close. There was a considerable scattering of replies to the degree of responsibility in the catagories of advisory or direct, but when the total responses to each catagory are compared there is one hundred percent agreement in the category of advisory responsibility and, in the category of direct responsibility for curriculum development toward the named agencies, eighty-two percent of the supervisors agreed with the Institute participants. Accepting the close agreement in all areas of response, it is believed that the participants had the curriculum development responsibilities they said they did and the data is acceptable.

When the participants were asked to consider questions concerning their activities in curriculum development with certain additional educational groups, Table 3, page 11, it was discovered that supervisors and participants alike indicated they believed the guide had been used by the participant to a high degree in his curriculum work. Question 4, Table 3, is the area of least agreement. However, the Institute's guide was obviously used to a high degree. All of the participants stated the guide had high usage in the area of staff instruction and their supervisors tended to agree.

HAS RESPONSIBILITY				EXTENT OF RESPONSIBILITY (DIRECT = LEGAL OR BY REGULATION)												AGENCIES SERVED BY PARTICIPANT-	REMARKS
YES		NO		ADVISORY						DIRECT							
				PARTIC			SUPERV			PARTIC			SUPERV				
PARTICIPANT	SUPERVISOR	PARTICIPANT	SUPERVISOR	VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH	VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH	VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH	VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH		COMPARISON OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PARTICIPANT IN THE OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR CONCERNING WHETHER THE PARTICIPANT'S POSITION GAVE HIM CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD THE LISTED AGENCIES AND HOW MUCH
3	3	6	6	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	UNIVERSITY	TALLY OF REPLIES FROM PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR SUPERVISORS
4	4	5	5	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	2	STATE DEPT. OF ED.	
2	1	7	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	
3	3	6	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	VO-TECH. SCHOOL	
5	5	4	4	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	SECONDARY SCHOOL	
2	2	7	7	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	RESEARCH COORD. UNIT	
33	33	67	67	0	11	0	0	22	0	11	0	11	0	0	11	UNIVERSITY	PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPLIES DERIVED FROM TALLY. n = 9 EACH GROUP
45	45	55	55	0	22	0	0	11	11	22	0	11	0	0	22	STATE DEPT. OF ED.	
22	11	78	89	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	
33	33	67	67	0	11	0	0	11	11	11	11	0	0	11	11	VO-TECH. SCHOOL	
56	56	44	44	0	11	22	0	22	0	0	0	33	0	11	11	SECONDARY SCHOOL	
22	22	78	78	0	11	0	0	22	0	0	0	11	0	0	11	RESEARCH COORD. UNIT	
																	TABLE 2

TABLE 3

USED GUIDE TO:	PARTICIPANT n = 9	SUPERVISOR n = 9
1. Instruct and guide others on your staff.	78%	89%
2. Guide or instruct others outside your staff.	89%	78%
3. Develop instructions for your institute.	89%	67%
4. Develop plans for other institutions	78%	45%

TABLE 4

GUIDE USED WITH LISTED GROUPS:	n = 9 PARTICIPANTS YES	n = 9 SUPERVISORS YES
a. Education	53%	53%
b. Community	26%	11%
c. Vo-Ed Groups only	58%	63%
d. Advisory Committee	47%	58%

Several groups were named and the question was asked if the participant had held general meetings with the groups to explain his experiences at the Institute and the guide produced there. Table 4, page 11 illustrate the replies received. The question also included a part asking the extent the participant used the guide for the meetings. Since not all respondents made judgments and answered this part of the question, the data is rejected. Those who did reply showed a trend toward high usage of the guide. There was excellent agreement between the supervisors and participants as to the amount the participant had explained the Institute and its guide to the four groups when the responses were combined for an average.

An important question to this study was concerned with how the participant rated the significance of the items listed in Table 5, page 13, in influencing changes in curriculum development that can be related to the Institute and its guide. A study of the response shows that the guide is considered to have much value as an instrument for improving curriculum and instruction and that many changes in curriculum development have occurred because of it.

When several groups having general interest for vocational education were listed, Table 6, page 14, was developed from the responses from the supervisors and the participants. This question was intended to gain some estimate of the amount of contact the participant had made in an effort to explain the Institute's guide and determine to some extent what effect he might have had as a change agent. Since this was an estimate, no direct comparisons can be made from the data. There is positive evidence that the participants have made contacts to a considerable degree and their supervisors tend to agree with them. Not all of the respondents in either group made the judgment as to the degree of acceptance of the guide by the groups contacted, but the majority of the participants rated acceptance in the moderate to high range while the supervisors rated the same factor highest in the moderate range.

All of the supervisors stated that they would send another person to a curriculum development institute such as that held at Oregon State University in 1967 and all of the participants agreed that they would like to attend another such institute.

Fifty-five percent of the participants stated that their present evaluation of the decision model presented in the Institute's guide was that it is very helpful and 45 percent believed it moderately helpful. Seventy-eight percent of them valued the decision model of the guide more highly now than they did at the time of the end of the institute in 1967. Twenty-two percent reported no change in their value of the instrument.

Of the nine participants reporting, four stated they had either alone or with others produced a curriculum guide since their attendance at the Institute (forty-five percent).

TABLE 5

HOW DO YOU RATE THE INSTITUTE AND GUIDE IN:	PARTICIPANT n = 9	SUPERVISOR n = 9
1. Its ability to promote its ideas about curriculum development?		
a. highly successful	33%	45%
b. moderately successful	67%	33%
c. not successful	0%	0%
no reply		22%
2. Its usefulness by persons who have not attended the Institute?		
a. much used	33%	45%
b. seldom used	56%	55%
c. not used	11%	0%
no reply		0%
3. Its value in improving curriculum and instruction?		
a. much value	89%	67%
b. little value	11%	22%
c. no value	0%	0%
no reply		11%
4. In helping the participant promote changes in curriculum development? (In terms of number of changes)		
a. many changes	45%	22%
b. some changes	55%	67%
c. no changes	0%	0%
no reply		11%

GROUP NAME	PARTICIPANT REPLY						SUPERVISOR REPLY					
	USED GUIDE IN PERCENTAGE n = 9	INTEREST			NO. MEETINGS	NO. PERSONS	USED GUIDE IN PERCENTAGE n = 9	INTEREST			NO. MEETINGS	NO. PERSONS
		LOW	MODERATE	HIGH				LOW	MODERATE	HIGH		
1. AMER. VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. STATE VO-ED ASSOCIATION	78	11	67	0	10	372	67	11	44	0	6	73
3. TEACHER TRAINING (UNIV.)	78	11	11	33	20	206	56	11	11	11	10	126
4. TEACHER CONVENTION	22	11	11	0	60	190	33	0	22	0	0	40
5. TEACHER IN-SERVICE TRAINING	78	11	22	11	32	840	67	11	33	11	35	612
6. STAFF TRAINING	89	0	33	33	11	58	56	11	22	11	23	92
7. RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT	56	11	22	22	6	43	22	0	11	0	2	2
8. WORKSHOPS	56	11	11	22	12	295	56	0	33	11	6	121
9. ADVISORY GROUPS	44	11	11	11	14	131	56	11	22	11	12	126
10. SERVICE GROUPS	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	11	0	0	4	45
11. STUDENT GROUPS	33	0	22	11	8	150	33	11	11	0	5	19
12. ADMINISTRATORS	56	0	33	11	8	124	33	0	22	0	7	21
13. SCHOOL BOARDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. OTHERS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OF MEETINGS HELD & PERSONS ATTENDING					183	2409					112	1277

PARTICIPANT AND SUPERVISOR ESTIMATE OF PARTICIPANT'S USE OF INSTITUTE GUIDE WITH THE NAME GROUPS, EXTENT OF INTEREST IN GUIDE, AND ITS IDEAS SHOWN BY THE GROUP, AND THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS ATTENDING THE MEETING.

TABLE 6

RESULTS

PART 2

THE STATES LISTED BELOW ARE THOSE STATES WHICH HAD NO PARTICIPANTS FROM WHICH CONTROLS REPORTED COMPARED WITH STATES FROM WHICH PARTICIPANTS IN THE OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE REPORTED.

The participant states were selected on the basis of population similarities or geographic proximity to the states from which no Institute participants had come.

PARTICIPANT STATES	NON-PARTICIPANT STATES
CONNECTICUT CONSULTANT, STATE DEPT. OF ED.	COLORADO VO-ED DIRECTOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ADULT VO-ED VO-ED DIRECTOR COM. COLLEGE
OKLAHOMA DIRECTOR AREA VO-TECH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL VO-TECH ED. CENTER	MINNESOTA ASST MARKETING DIRECTOR
KANSAS ASS'T PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION	NEBRASKA CONSULTANT, STATE DEPT OF ED.
ARIZONA DIRECTOR, AREA VO-ED CENTER	NEW MEXICO SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR VO-ED SECONDARY VO-ED TEACHER
IDAHO DE COORDINATOR SECONDARY SCHOOL	MONTANA VO-ED TECH SCHOOL ADMINIS. VO-ED COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NEVADA AREA ADMINISTRATOR VO-ED	SOUTH DAKOTA DIRECTOR AREA VO-ED SCHOOL
WISCONSIN SUPERVISOR OF CURRICULUM	NORTH DAKOTA SECONDARY VO-ED ADMINIS.

The first item studied was the similarity of position and responsibility between the two groups. Table 8, following page, was developed for this comparison.

The results showed that eight members of the participant groups had heavier responsibilities toward the State Department of Education and university than did the control group. This could be accounted for by the larger number of participants in the supervisory catagories in the participant group as compared with the controls. In the area of the Vocational-Technical schools and secondary schools, the comparison was very good.

HAD RESPONSIBILITY				EXTENT OF RESPONSIBILITY												AGENCY SERVED	REMARKS
YES		NO		ADVISORY						DIRECT							
				PARTIC			CONTROL			PARTIC			CONTROL				
PARTICIPANT	CONTROL	PARTICIPANT	CONTROL	LITTLE	SOME	MUCH	LITTLE	SOME	MUCH	LITTLE	SOME	MUCH	LITTLE	SOME	MUCH		
4	1	4	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	UNIVERSITY	COMPARISON OF PERCEPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES TOWARD CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION HELD BY PARTICIPANT AS OPPOSED TO THAT OF CONTROL FROM STATE NOT PARTICIPATING IN OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE
6	4	2	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2	STATE DEPT. OF ED.	TALLY OF REPLIES FROM PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS
2	2	6	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	
5	7	3	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	3	VO-TECH SCHOOL	
6	8	2	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	2	4	SECONDARY SCHOOL	
3	1	5	10	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	RESEARCH COORD. UNIT	
50	9	50	91	0	13	0	0	0	0	13	0	25	9	0	0	UNIVERSITY	PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPLIES DERIVED FROM TALLY.
75	36	25	64	0	13	0	9	0	0	13	0	33	9	0	18	STATE DEPT. OF ED.	
25	18	75	82	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	18	COMMUNITY COLLEGE	
63	55	37	45	0	13	0	9	0	9	0	13	33	9	18	27	VO-TECH SCHOOL	PARTICIPANT n = 8 CONTROL n = 11
75	73	25	27	0	0	25	0	9	9	0	0	50	0	18	36	SECONDARY SCHOOL	
38	9	62	91	0	25	0	9	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	9	RESEARCH COORD. UNIT	
																	TABLE 8

The relationship between advisory and direct responsibilities was very close. The groups were considered comparable in responsibilities. (Direct responsibility is defined as assigned by statute or regulation.)

Table 9, following page, indicates the response from participants and controls from non-participating states stating they had alone or with others prepared a curriculum guide for use by staff members of schools, school systems, or college programs.

The percentage of comparison between participants and controls who had produced a guide alone or with others was almost identical. For this portion of the study, the dates of publication of the guides is not considered highly significant data. The eleven controls produced four curriculum guides and the participants produced four during or since the summer of 1967. Assuming the controls who did not date the publication of their guides were indicating their guides were old publications, a comparison of 50 percent of the participants and 36 percent of the controls published guides since the July dates of the Institute. Thus, the Institute participants produced fourteen percent more material than the controls. Except, of course, all participants had helped produce the Institute guide.

The participants had, of course, all attended an institute for curriculum development and all replied that they would like to attend another. The control group was a different situation. Only eighteen percent of the controls had attended an institute for curriculum development. This accounts for only two people and one of these would not like to attend another. The remaining ten would like to attend a curriculum institute.

Table 10, page 19, compares the use to which the participants put the Institute's guide for certain educational purposes. The replies from the control group to the same questions had reference to their own material.

It is apparent from the percentage comparison, table 10, that the participants used the Institute guide a great deal more in all respects than the controls had used theirs. Taking into account the concentration of school people in the control group who might not plan curriculum for another's staff or a college, the comparison of effort is strongly in favor of the participant group. Overall comparison shows the participant group used the Institute guide to an extent of 51% more than the control group used theirs.

The data collected in Table 11, page 19, shows the amount of activity on the part of the participants and controls in holding general meetings to explain, as appropriate, the Institute guide or the locally produced guide.

TABLE 9

GUIDES WERE PRODUCED BY PARTICIPANTS AND CONTROLS:							
PRODUCED GUIDE						DATE OF PUBLICATION	
PARTICIPANT TALLY n = 8			CONTROL TALLY n = 11			PARTICIPANT	CONTROL
YES	NO	PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS STATING THEY HAD PRODUCED A GUIDE	YES	NO	PERCENT OF CONTROLS STATING THEY HAD PRODUCED A GUIDE		
1			1			July 1968	July 1968
1			1			Jan. 1967	No Date
	1			1			
	1			1			
1			1			July 1967	Aug. 1966
1			1			July 1968	Aug. 1969
	1			1			
1			1			June 1968	Sept. 1969
				1			
			1				No Date
		63%	1		64%		Aug 1968

TABLE 10

EXTENT YOU USED GUIDE FOR THE PURPOSES GIVEN.	PARTICIPANT TALLY n = 8			CONTROL TALLY n = 11		
	LITTLE	MUCH	NONE	LITTLE	MUCH	NONE
1. To instruct and guide others on your staff.	38%	50%	12%	0%	55%	45%
2. To instruct other's staff.	50%	50%	0%	36%	9%	55%
3. Curriculum planning in a school.	38%	62%	0%	0%	55%	45%
4. Curriculum planning in a college.	75%	12%	13%	9%	9%	82%
Averages of Percentages	50%	44%	6%	11%	32%	57%

TABLE 11

DID YOU EXPLAIN YOUR GUIDE TO:	PARTICIPANT n = 8		CONTROL n = 11	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
1. Community groups?	25%	75%	18%	82%
2. Educational groups?	50%	50%	64%	36%
3. Vocational-Ed. groups only?	63%	37%	0%	100%
4. Advisory groups	50%	50%	64%	36%
Averages of Percentages	47%	53%	37%	63%

The participants had worked with their guide an overall ten percent more, while holding general meetings, than had the control group. It is difficult to understand the response to question 3, table 11, on the part of the controls. When working with advisory groups, it would seem normal for the meetings to be held with staff members present. If for no other reason, the fact that advisory meetings were held and the respondent was there in his capacity as a vocational educator should reasonably be sufficient for some positive response on the part of the control.

The apparent failure of this question clouds the value of the data in determining any difference between the two groups.

Several groups having general interest for vocational education were listed, Table 12, following page, was developed from the responses from the participants and controls. This question was intended to gain some estimate of the amount of contact each group had made in an effort for the participant to explain the value of the Institute's guide and the control to explain his. This data was to determine the extent each could be considered a change agent for curriculum development in vocational education.

The results in Table 12 show the Institute participants used their guide on an average of five percent more than the control group used theirs. The control group estimated they had held 74 meetings and contacted 782 persons while the participant group held 79 meetings to contact 1636 persons. Even though the question is intended to be an estimate, the data from both groups on the number of meetings held and number of persons contacted is subject to some reservations.

The important differences in the estimated use of the guide with the different groups named in table 12 is that the participants reached, to a much greater degree than the controls, State Vocational Associations, teacher training at the University, teacher in-service training, staff training, administrators and Research Coordinating Units where the impact of their effort can be most effective for change in curriculum development.

TABLE 12

Participant and control groups estimate of: the number of sessions held with the named groups; the estimated number of persons in attendance; the percent of participants using the Institute guide; and the percent of controls using their own guide.

GROUP NAME	PARTICIPANT n = 8			CONTROL n = 11		
	Using Guide %	Number Sessions Tally	Number Attend-ing Tally	Using Guide %	Number Sessions Tally	Number Attend-ing Tally
1. Amer.Vocational Ass'n	0	0	0	1	2	6
2. State Vo-Ed Ass'n	5	9	338	3	7	220
3. Teacher Training (U)	6	14	26	1	4	19
4. Teacher Convention	1	2	100	2	8	60
5. Teacher in-service	5	20	655	2	8	120
6. Staff Training	5	4	29	2	8	50
7. Research Coord. Unit	5	5	42	0	0	0
8. Workshops	3	9	170	2	5	85
9. Advisory Groups	3	10	112	2	10	80
10. Service Groups	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Student Groups	1	6	100	2	4	90
12. Administrators	6	7	64	1	12	22
13. School Boards	0			1	6	30
14. Others	0			0		
TOTAL		79	1636		74	782

RESULTS

PART 3

DATA COMPARING A TOTAL OF NINETEEN PARTICIPANT REPLIES TO THIRTY-THREE NON-PARTICIPANT (CONTROL) REPLIES TO SIGNIFICANT QUESTIONS ASKED EACH GROUP.

Questions were asked in such a manner that the participant, when appropriate, was responding to his questionnaire on the basis of his experiences in the Institute during the Summer of 1967 and his use of the guide which was a product of the Institute. The controls were considering curriculum materials they had developed either by themselves or with others.

The first question dealt with whether the respondents had responsibility for the development of curriculum for vocational education in certain educational agencies. Table 13, page 23, names the agencies and gives the percentage comparison of the responses.

It was found that the percentage comparison of those stating they had responsibility for the named agencies was very close in most respects and when the total replies were averaged between the groups, they were found to have almost identical overall amounts of responsibility for curriculum development in vocational education. Even the division of their responsibility in the catagories of advisory and direct was extremely close. The two groups were considered very satisfactory for comparison.

Controls were asked if they had alone or with others developed a curriculum guide or other curriculum materials of a similar nature. Fifty-five percent said they had. This compares with fifty-eight percent of the Institute participants said they had developed curriculum guides for the use of staff members of schools, school systems, or college programs. Of course, all of the participants had contributed effort toward the development of the guide produced by the Institute. Comparing this effort to the amount of material produced by the control group, the participants had exceeded the production of the control group by forty-five percent in the latter instance, and 3 percent in at home activity.

A comparison between the participant group and the control group member's use of their respective guides in general meetings with specified groups brought out the information in Table 14, page 23. The table shows that the participants made an overall 14 percent greater use of their (Institute) guide at general meetings than had the controls. The participants indicated a forty-nine percent greater use of their guide with vocational educators than did the controls.

TABLE 13

Do you have curriculum development responsibilities for one or more of the following educational agencies:

AGENCY	Percent Saying They Have Responsibility PARTICIPANT n = 19	CONTROL n = 33
University	21%	18%
State Department of Education	41	39
Community College	26	38
Vo-Tech School	41	60
Secondary School	73	72
Research Coordinating Unit	21	18
Average All Agencies	45%	49%

What is the extent of your responsibility to the agencies in the categories shown?

	ADVISORY	DIRECT
Control Group	33%	67%
Participant Group	29%	71%

TABLE 14

Did you use your curriculum guide for general meetings with the following groups?

GROUPS	PARTICIPANT n = 19			CONTROL n = 33		
	USED	NOT USED	NO REPLY	USED	NOT USED	NO REPLY
1. Education	53%	32%	15%	55%		45%
2. Community	26%	53%	21%	12%		89%
3. Vo-Ed Only	58%	26%	16%	9%	27%	64%
4. Advisory	47%	42%	11%	52%		48%
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE	46%	38%	16%	32%	7%	62%

Table 15, page 25 , was developed to compare the extent the two groups had used their guides in working with educational institution groups. The response shows an eighteen percent higher overall use of their guide by the participants over the controls. In the area of curriculum planning in a school, the controls showed an extremely high usage in comparison to the participants. This is probably caused by the locally developed curriculum guide being devised for this purpose while the Institute guide was more general in its presentation of the decision model for curriculum development.

It should be stated here that, in many instances, the tally of replies to questions will not result in an indication that one hundred percent of the number of participants or controls answered the question since it is possible for several responses to a single question to be selected by an individual.

In attempting to further evaluate the amount of activity there was on the part of the participant to use the Institute's guide as a tool for fulfilling his role as a change agent, certain groups were named and the controls and participants asked to estimate the number of sessions each had presented the ideas contained in their respective guides to each group. They were also asked to estimate the numbers they believed to be in attendance at the meetings. The data is compiled in table 16, page 26.

The results show that the controls estimated they had met with more sessions of the named groups than had the participants. The participants estimated they had met with 1250 more people in the process of presenting their guide than had the controls. The important difference in the estimates lies in the much greater effort expended by the participants with state vocational education associations, teacher training at the University, the in-service training of teachers, workshops, student groups and administrator where the change agent possibilities are greatest.

In rating the value of their respective guide for its ability to promote the contained ideas about curriculum development; its usefulness without follow up; and its value in improving curriculum and instruction; the respondents supplied the data for Table 17, page 27. Not all of the controls responded to the questions. This was probably accounting for those who said they had not developed a curriculum guide while, of course, all participants had. Therefore, no effort was made to correct the data to account for the persons who did not reply from the control group. By inspection, it can be seen from the table that the two groups compare heavily in favor of the participant in his estimate of the value of his guide, and when this fact is weighed with the considerations stated in the paragraph above, showing the persons he is working with, he demonstrates he is convinced of the value of the guide and its ideas.

TABLE 15

GUIDE USED TO:	PARTICIPANT n=19 NOT USED	USED	CONTROL n=33 NOT USED	USED
1. Instruction of others on own staff	10%	90%	62%	35%
2. Instruction of other's staff	10%	90%	73%	27%
3. Curriculum planning in a school	16%	4%	10%	90%
4. Curriculum planning in a school	26%	74%	58%	42%

TABLE 16

Groups to which the controls and participants explained these guides. Includes the number of estimated meetings and approximate attendance plus the degree of acceptance of the methods in their guide.

GROUP NUMBER	PARTICIPANT (n = 19)		CONTROL (n = 33)	
	NUMBER SESSIONS	ATTENDENCE	NUMBER SESSIONS	ATTENDENCE
1	0	0	3	106
2	11	450	13	225
3	31	478	14	92
4	8	370	10	490
5	43	988	60	454
6	40	181	89	252
7	12	25	9	54
8	17	416	8	100
9	13	186	34	223
10	0	0	0	0
11	22	463	14	115
12	29	200	58	60
13	1	5	21	352
14	5	20	8	8
TOTALS	232	3,782	341	2,531

Group indicated by group number:

1. American Vocational Association
2. State Vo-Ed Association
3. Teacher Training (Univ.)
4. Teacher Convention
5. In-service teachers
6. Staff training
7. R.C.U. (Personnel)
8. Workshops
9. Advisory groups
10. Service groups
11. Student groups
12. Administrators
13. School boards
14. Others

TABLE 17

HOW DO YOU RATE YOUR GUIDE IN:	PARTICIPANT n = 19	CONTROL n = 33
1. Its ability to promote its ideas about curriculum development?		
(a) Highly successful	42%	20%
(b) Moderately successful	58%	42%
(c) Not successful	0%	0%
2. Its usefulness without follow-up?		
(a) Much used	32%	39%
(b) Seldom used	58%	20%
(c) Not used	10%	3%
3. Its value in improving curriculum and instruction?		
(a) Much value	79%	46%
(b) Little value	21%	12%
(c) No value	0%	0%
NO RESPONSE NOT ACCOUNTED FOR		

There was a considerable contrast in the replies from each group when they were asked to evaluate their own efforts to effect change through the use of their respective guides (Institute and locally produced). All of the participants replied to the question. Thirty-two percent believed they had caused many changes and sixty-eight percent believed they had caused some changes to occur. The controls showed a response indicating thirty-seven percent believed they had caused many changes while at the same time twelve percent believed they had made some change.

Sixty-nine percent of the controls had not attended an institute for instruction in curriculum development, but all stated they would be interested in doing so. All of the participants replied that they would like to attend another curriculum development institute. Most of the participants thought a two-week time was most desirable for the length of an institute although several said that a period as long as four weeks would be acceptable.

Of the nineteen participants responding to the questionnaire, sixty-eight percent said they valued the decision model presented in the Institute guide more now than they did at the time of the ending of the Institute. One person valued it less highly and twenty-six percent had no change in value. Sixty-eight percent stated that they had found the decision model very helpful in their work.

In a survey of topics for future institutes suggested by the Oregon State University participants and non-participants, cross-group clusters emerged in areas involving:

(1) Disadvantaged youth.
(2) Individualized instruction.
(3) Evluation procedures.
(4) Practical problems confronting vocation education administrators.
(5) Teaching method innovations.

One additional observation might be cited as being, that from all the topic suggestions, those coming from the institute participants were much more specific, illustrating perhaps that when persons are involved in the atmosphere of change and idea exchange provided by an institute, they are more aware of their needs and wants for future information.

RESULTS

PART 4

STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ANSWERING QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE SITUATION IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN THEIR AGENCY.

Thirty-five State Directors of Vocational Education replied to a total of fifty-three questionnaires sent out. (Three were to Territorial Directors who replied.)

The directors stated that their responsibility for the development of curriculum in vocational education was distributed as follows:

	Tally	Percent n=35
a. Assigned by the statutes of their state.	6	17
b. Assigned by the State Board for Vocational Education regulations.	15	43
c. Advisory only to local agencies	14	40

This response compares favorably with that of participants and controls.

To determine where the responsibility for curriculum development rested in the various agencies of the state, the list, Table 18, page 32 was developed. The table demonstrates that the State Board for Vocational Education (including State Directors and Supervisors have, by far, the greatest responsibility for final approval of curriculum. This is understandable since State Plans for Vocational Education would require curriculum approval by the State Director as a representative of the State Board, or the Board itself, when Federal funds were to be used.

The data places the responsibility for curriculum development in the hands of state supervisors according to the nineteen persons of the possible 35 who answered this part of the question. There is still a large portion of the curriculum development going on in the local school area though. Ten persons said the local school board developed curriculum and sixteen indicated it was done by the local administration. Two persons mentioned a local curriculum and materials center and eight said the Research Coordinating Unit did curriculum development.

The State Directors identified they had accomplished the work outlined in Table 19, page 33, to improve curriculum in vocational education since the passage of the Vocational Education act of 1963. The work indicates the publishing of many new curriculum guides and

greatly increased involvement of the advisory committee in the development of curriculum. Programs for alerting educators to curriculum planning needs were developed in fifty-seven percent of the reporting states and seventy-five percent had established new programs to help teachers effect needed curriculum plans. In the category of "other" the effort had gone toward developing an awareness of the need for vocational education.

Asked what extent certain factors may have had on the extent of change reported in Table 19, page 33, the Directors furnished the data contained in Table 20, page 34. It appears from the data that those trained in curriculum development have had a good effect upon the general situation. The data in Table 21, page 34, would seem to corroborate the statements made in Table 20. Seventy-seven percent of the directors said they would continue to send staff members to curriculum development institutes.

For those State Directors who did not have staff members attend a curriculum development institute, the reasons given were:

1. Previous State Director was not curriculum oriented.
2. Pressure of professional responsibilities.
3. Lack of out-of-state travel funds.
4. Generally, lacking travel funds (Territorial response).
5. Limited participation due to lack of funds.
6. Lack of funds for this purpose.
7. Travel restrictions--busy schedules.
8. Oregon conflict of time when load was greatest.
9. We have no one on the staff who can be released and in this state, curriculum development has not been perceived as a responsibility of the State Office.

The Directors had the following comments on the nature of the workshops they would like their staff members to attend:

1. New innovations—flexible modular scheduling.
2. Individualization of instruction.
3. Flexibility of programming.
4. Program evaluation, behavoral objectives and meeting the needs of the disadvantaged and handicapped. No longer than one week for the institute.
5. Modification of curriculum materials for vocational education secondary, post secondary and adult students. Length; one to two weeks.
6. Held during school year—Curriculum development is a summer activity. Professional staff cannot easily be spared during peak load time.
7. Three day minimum length.
8. New techniques—instructional systems.

9. Development of personnel for vocational curriculum materials development. Two weeks with a minimum of one month between first and second week—developing the model during the first --testing model second week.
10. Suggest from one to two week sessions with the focus on new techniques of curriculum and material development. I prefer the "limited number of participant approach" with less time on general discussion and more time allotted to practial applications. I fully realize the difficulty of structuring such an institute, but if it is not meaningful and useful the results are far from good. Occupational education must become innovative and I support institutes that will provide staff members the challenge to do so.

TABLE 18

What are the responsibilities of the following agencies or persons in development of curriculum for the schools of your state?

	None	Advisory Function	Develop Curriculum	Recommend Approval	Final Approval
a. State Board for Vocational Education.	6	6	9	5	20
b. Local School Board.	2	11	10	8	7
c. State Director.	0	11	8	24	7
d. State Supervisors.	0	12	19	17	3
e. Research Coordinating Unit.	1	22	8	4	0
f. Advisory Council.	5	26	0	5	1
g. Employment Security.	7	26	0	2	0
h. Organized Labor.	7	25	1	3	0
i. Industry.	5	27	1	3	0
j. Business.	5	25	1	3	0
k. Local Administration.	0	15	16	9	4
l. Other. (Local Curriculum Comm. Curriculum & Materials Center)	0	0	2	0	0

TABLE 19

3. Since the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P.L.88-120) has your office made any of the following changes in its efforts to improve curriculum in vocational-technical education. If yes, in what school year did the change take place.

YES			1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
26	a.	Published new curriculum guides.	4	5	4	7	4	9
17	b.	Established new procedures for curriculum development.	2	1	5	1	0	4
24	c.	Developed increased involvement of advisory committees in curriculum development.	2	4	3	3	0	4
20	d.	Development methods or programs for alerting educators to curriculum planning needs.	1	3	0	2	2	3
12	e.	Established programs for training staff in procedures for effecting curriculum planning needs.	0	0	1	2	1	4
25	f.	Established new programs designed to help teachers effect needed curriculum changes.	4	3	5	4	2	4
3	g.	Developing awareness and acceptance	0	0	0	0	0	1

TABLE 20

4. To what extent were the changes reported in Question 3 attributable to the following actions by your office?

MUCH	LITTLE	NOT AT ALL	
6	8	5	a. Attendance of a staff member at a curriculum training institute.
13	5	13	b. Employment of a staff member specially skilled in curriculum development
12	10	8	c. Establishment of a Research Coordinating Unit.
4	0	0	d. (Other) Recognized need.

TABLE 21

If any of your staff members <u>did</u> attend curriculum institutes, please answer the following questions.

Were there observable consequences with respect to the contributions of such staff members in the following areas of curriculum development in your schools

YES		
20	a.	Improved teaching methods
24	b.	Systems for effecting curriculum change.
18	c.	Follow-up procedures
	d.	(Other)

RESULTS

PART 5

REPORT OF PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WITH NINE STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

The State Directors of Vocational Education were most gracious in their willingness to spend time with the interviewers. The interviews were done at the time the new State Plans were being developed in response to the requirements of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

It must be appreciated that the staff of most of the State Offices is limited in size to the point of just being able to complete the services required to get the basic job of vocational education done.

In their efforts to be helpful with their suggestions for curriculum development institutes, there was a very strong plea for regionalization of curriculum development institutes, provided that institutes conducted by the U. S. Office of Education could not be conducted for each state to help meet its individual needs for curriculum change. It was strongly believed that states having close proximity could benefit from the association of their vocational educators with one another. The similarity of problems would allow many of the solutions found by the participants in an institute to be directly applied to their individual state without further development from a model that, at best, would only be a guideline to a sequence of events.

It was difficult to get any of the visited State Directors to say directly that the Oregon State University Summer Institute for Curriculum Development of 1967 had made a substantial contribution to the development of vocational curriculum. They admitted their inability to be fully aware of the full extent of the use of the decision model presented in the Institute's guide since the detailed problem of curriculum development was not a major part of their activity.

At the time of the visitations, there was a decided lack of funds for operation of the needed vocational programs in the States. One state had, however, developed an excellent guide for A Systems Approach to State-Local Program Planning for Vocational Technical and Continuing Education.

The following pages are notes synthesized from those taken at the time of the interviews.

REPORTS OF VISITS TO STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION REFERENCE TO CURRICULUM SEMINARS, ETC.

State Directors of the following states were personally interviewed:

Tennessee	California
Pennsylvania	New Mexico
Illinois	Colorado
Iowa	Idaho
	Nebraska

	Federal	Regional	State	Local	University
Whose function should it be to lead the curriculum seminars?		Most Desired	Desired		
Who benefits most from seminars of the nature of the O.S.U. Institute?			Officials		Involved w/curriculum
Who benefits least from seminars of the nature of the O.S.U. Institute?				X	

- - - - - - - - -

What carrythrough is there from national institutes to State Director?

It is limited from local participants.

What carrythrough is there from national institutes to local districts?

It is limited unless from a state conference.

PERTINENT STATEMENTS FROM DIRECTORS

Seminars are "farmed-out" to universities without considering needs to State.
There should be planning with states first to find out what their needs are rather than arbitrary setting up meetings.
The so-called vocational seminars tend to lean to academic views because they have academic leaders.
If Washington, D. C. continues to hold "tight reins" in U.S. Office, then seminars should be conducted by Washington, but state directors prefer regional.
If going to do something is to be innovative, must have large enough cadry of people from one state to go back to that state to make the change.

Little feedback from local participants due to: 1) lack of numbers participating and 2) lack of materials reproduced from institute not widely disseminated.
If state has a good idea, feel U. S. Office should fund in specific state because that is where change-makers are; change will come from within a state.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

More individual participation by seminar participants; not so much lecture.
These should be more regional-planned seminars "drawing on similarities" with involvement of larger groups from single states.
Get the seminar where the "change-makers" are.
Regional institutes should be geared toward "a problem" on a need in a region.
University has a role in curriculum development, the univerisity personnel should be involved in curriculum institutes.

CONCLUSIONS

The basic purpose of this study was to assess the Curriculum Development Institute and evaluate the guide which was produced through the Institute. More exactly, this study served to discover the effects of the vocational education curriculum guide in use since its construction at the Summer Institute held on the Oregon State University campus in 1967. Originally, the Institute was intended to help the participants gain new knowledge or reorganize existent knowledge of curriculum design or theory, increase familarity with innovative programs and practices related to vocational education curriculum development and also enable these participants to use their knowledge as change agents in their own areas of endeavour.

Through the collection and interpretation of data received from the groups tested, it is evident that the participants are effectively serving as change agents. This is indicated by the numbers of persons with whom they are meeting who can benefit from the use of the decision model for curriculum development contained in the Institute's guide. It is not possible to conclude, however, that the participants have produced an appreciably greater amount of curriculum material for local use than the control group which contained very few who had attended a curriculum development institute. There may be some accounting for this fact since presenting the guide and explaining its decision model hopefully would start a chain of events that would eventuate in the production of local materials for curriculum development which the participants had no other hand in producing than getting the process started. This leaves one with the need to make a value judgment from other evidence. The control group was asked to submit copies of their locally developed curriculum materials for study. These materials were scanned to discover that none contained a research model for curriculum development which was similar to the one drawn up at the Oregon State University Institute in 1967. None of the materials showed the development of a "Philosophical Frame of Reference." From this information it is possible to make the value judgment that materials produced by the Institute participants had a higher probability of producing quality in vocational education curriculum development than did the materials produced by the controls.

It might be observed that the success of actual Institute guide usage might have been increased if the participants had used the strength of ideas gained in the Institute to modify their already existing guides to fit the needs of their individual areas.

The success of the Institute in making the participants good change agents in curriculum development can be measured by making some conclusions concerning their work with groups interested in curriculum development for vocational education.

In comparison with the control group, the participants are reaching and explaining the Institute's guide to many more people who are able to make changes in curriculum than are the controls. The spreading effect of this activity can eventuate in an over-all improvement in curriculum which will have a lasting effect. The data obtained supports the conclusion that the participants did succeed, over-all, in their roles of change agents.

Another element of success evidenced by participant response was their personal high value placed upon the Institute and the guide it produced. The majority still feel that the guide has much value in producing improvements in instruction and curriculum and they are, through its use, making progress in changing curriculum development.

With regard to the instructional content of the Institute, it must be concluded that the theoretical material presented was acceptable and useful as evidenced by the use of the guide by the participants. Many of the participants did express an opinion that they believed the Institute should have brought together more consultants who knew vocational education at the operational level. The implication being that more of the practical problems of vocational curriculum development might have been more successfully discussed. The State Directors were reflecting this same opinion when they suggested that they were interested in regional or state institutes which could wrestle with local problems. One of the Institute speakers with whom the Institute was discussed outside of the context of this study made the observation that more people who were close to the instruction in vocational education could have been involved as consultants to the Institute.

As a final conclusion, it must be observed that the Institute met its objectives in training the participants as change agents and giving the participants a guide to assist them in their work.

The fact that sixty-three percent of the Institute participants returned questionnaires indicating they still believed in the value of the decision model and were meeting with some success in making changes in curriculum development, indicates that after two years, the Institute is still having a beneficial effect.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The staff of future institutes for curriculum development should have a mix of those strong in theoretical knowledge and those from both education and industry who know what is required of vocational education at the operational level. Institute planning should be done together.

2. Curriculum development institutes for regional or state personnel should be considered. A team of real experts in vocational education could be assembled to work with State Universities or other suitable higher education institutions to establish and develop in-state resources for curriculum development to serve as constant support for those developing curriculum in the schools and colleges.

3. Short and to the point workshops or other methods of follow-up should occur at regular intervals to reinforce the decisions or plans for curriculum development decided upon in planning sessions at institutes. This method of approach would help states work out a teacher training plan suitable to the solution of state and local problems in curriculum needs.

4. Institutes for curriculum development must be realistic in their acceptance of the fact that those who are most needful of help in curriculum development are those who are working with students. These people do not have time to translate highly theoretical decision models into practical operations. The translation would seem to be the work of the univeristies as they train new teachers and further develop those in the field. It is recommended that universities work together to develop suitable agreement between themselves and industry as to what constitutes quality vocational education in the first place. From this point, teacher education institutions could respond with meaningful vocational education teacher undergraduate and graduate programs based upon theories for obtaining quality in vocational education.

5. The development of curriculum in an institution requires study and heavy expenditures of energy if it is to be responsive to the needs of the students and industry. It is recommended that task forces be formed to assist institutions in obtaining and maintaining suitable curriculum. The task force should be composed of educators trained in curriculum development whose sole reason for employment is to work with institutions in curriculum development and supply that extra amount of energy necessary for real progress to be made.

APPENDIX

Letter to Non-Participant
(Control)

Dear

Oregon State University has been sponsoring institutes for vocational educators in an effort to support the improvement of programs of vocational education. In 1967, an institute was held on curriculum development at which the development of a curriculum guide was a basic product. We are now trying to evaluate the influence of that institute upon curriculum development procedures and practices among the institutions of our geographical region who did not have representation at the 1967 institute.

We hope, therefore, that you or your appropriate staff member will provide answers on the attached check list. To provide the answers should require no more than ten to fifteen minutes.

We would be greatly helped by having copies of any curriculum guides (or similar materials) that you have developed since the summer of 1967. Oregon State University will reimburse you for any cost of materials forwarded to us.

Your help is needed and will be much appreciated. We shall be glad to provide you with a copy of the report we shall develop.

Sincerely yours,

Henry A. Ten Pas
Director
Division of Vocational, Adult
and Community College Education

NON PARTICIPANT
QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____

SCHOOL_____

ADDRESS_____

Yes No

[] [] 1. Do you have responsibility for any aspect of curriculum development in vocational education?
   a. If "no," do not answer remaining questions. Sign the blank at top, and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

2. Is your responsibility for curriculum development in vocational educaton:

   [] advisory only?

   [] direct responsibility, as provided by law or regulation?

3. How much responsibility, whether advisory or direct, do you have for curriculum development in vocational education?

   [] the primary responsibility.

   [] one of several equal responsibilities.

   [] a minor responsibility.

4. With what types of institutions and/or agencies do your responsibilities cover? Check as many as your assignment requires.

   [] State Department.

   [] Research Coordinating Unit.

   [] University.

   [] Community College.

   [] Vocational-Technical School (area or post-secondary).

   [] Secondary School.

Yes No

[] [] 5. Have you (individually or with others) prepared a curriculum guide, or other similar materials, for use by staff members of schools, school systems, or college programs?
   a. 1) Give date of publication of materials_____
   month year

   2) Send a copy of guide or materials to Oregon State University.

b. To what extent was the guide used in:

	NOT AT ALL	LITTLE	MUCH
1) instruction of own staff			
2) instruction of other's staff			
3) curriculum planning in a school			
4) curriculum planning in a college			

6. Did you hold group meetings to explain the use and value of the curriculum guide (or similar document) with the follwoing groups?

Yes	No		If yes, how many sessions with group?	How many Attended?
[]	[]	American Vocational Associations	____	____
[]	[]	State Voc-Ed Assn.	____	____
[]	[]	Teacher training (Universities)	____	____
[]	[]	Teacher convention	____	____
[]	[]	In-service training of teachers	____	____
[]	[]	Staff training	____	____
[]	[]	Research Coordinating Unit Personnel	____	____
[]	[]	Workshops	____	____
[]	[]	Advisory groups	____	____
[]	[]	Service groups	____	____
[]	[]	Student groups	____	____
[]	[]	Administrators	____	____
[]	[]	School boards	____	____
[]	[]	(Others)	____	____
[]	[]		____	____
[]	[]		____	____

7. Check the groups listed below with whom you have discussed your curriculum guide (or materials).

Yes	No		If yes, how many sessions with group?	How many attended?
[]	[]	American Vocational Associations	____	____
[]	[]	State Voc-Ed Ass'n.	____	____
[]	[]	Teacher Training (Universities)	____	____
[]	[]	Teacher convention	____	____
[]	[]	In-service training of teachers	____	____
[]	[]	Staff training	____	____
[]	[]	Research Coordinating Unit personnel	____	____
[]	[]	Workshops	____	____
[]	[]	Advisory groups	____	____
[]	[]	Service groups	____	____
[]	[]	Student groups	____	____
[]	[]	Administrators	____	____
[]	[]	School boards	____	____
[]	[]	(Others)	____	____
[]	[]		____	____
[]	[]		____	____

8. How do you rate the guide or materials you produced in terms of:
   1) Its ability to promote its ideal about curriculum development?

      [] highly successful

      [] moderately successful

      [] not successful

2) Its usefulness without personal follow-up and supervision?

[] much used

[] seldom used

[] not used

3) Its value in producing observable curriculum change?

[] many changes resulted

[] few changes resulted

[] no changes resulted

9. How do you evaluate your own efforts to effect change through use of the guide or materials?

MUCH	LITTLE	NONE	
[]	[]	[]	extent of use
[]	[]	[]	degree of success

Yes No
[] [] 10. Have you attended an institute for curriculum development in vocational education?

Yes No
[] [] are you interested in attending such an institute?

_____
(Reason)

Name the institute or agency which sponsored the institute.

_____
(Name)

What was the length of the institute?

_____
(Length)

Letter to
State Directors of
Vocational Education

Dear

Oregon State University, like other universities, conducts institutes for vocational educators designed to stimulate improvements in curriculum development.

If institutes are to make important contributions to the needs of the entire system of vocational education, they should be planned with full knowledge of information that State Directors and their staffs can provide. To this end, we hope that you will join us in planning effective educational programs (institutes, workshops and other arrangements) to meet perceived needs in curriculum development.

You can help now by responding promptyly to the questions in the attached document. Any documents you have, especially in curriculum development and which you will share with us, will be greatefully received. Please bill the Oregon State University, Division of Vocational Education for the cost of any materials forwarded.

Your assistance and counsel will be valuable and we shall benefit from your cooperation. In return, we shall keep you informed of the results of our efforts.

Sincerely,

Henry A. Ten Pas
Director
Division of Vocational, Adult
and Community College Education

STATE DIRECTOR-VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____

STATE_____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the questions which follow as you perceive the situation in curriculum development in your agency from the standpoint of a State Director of Vocational Education.

1. Is the responsibility of your agency for the development of curriculum in vocational education:

   a. Assigned by statutes of your state? Yes_____ No_____

   b. Assigned by State Board for vocational education regulations? Yes_____ No_____

   c. Advisory only to local agencies? Yes_____ No_____

2. What are the responsibilities of the following agencies or persons in development of curriculum for the schools of your state?

	None	Advisory Function	Develop Curriculum	Recommended Approval	Final Approval
a. State Board for Vocational Education					
b. Local School Board					
c. State Director					
d. State Supervisors					
e. Research Coordinating Unit					
f. Advisory Council					
g. Employment Security					
h. Organized Labor					
i. Industry					
j. Business					
k. Local Administration					
l. Other					

3. Since the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P.L.88-120) has your office made any of the following changes in its efforts to improve curriculum in vocational-technical education? If yes, in what school year did the change take place?

Yes	No			Year
[]	[]	a.	Published new curriculum guides.	____
[]	[]	b.	Established new procedures for curriculum development.	____
[]	[]	c.	Developed increased involvement of advisory committees in curriculum development.	____
[]	[]	d.	Development methods or programs for alerting educators to curriculum planning needs.	____
[]	[]	e.	Established programs for training staff in procedures for effecting curriculum planning needs.	____
[]	[]	f.	Established new programs designed to help teachers effect needed curriculum changes.	____
		g.	_____ (Other please describe)	
			_____	
			_____	____

4. To what extent were the changes reported in question No. 3 attributable to the following actions by your office?

MUCH	LITTLE	NOT AT ALL	
			a. Attendance of a staff member at a curriculum training institute.
			b. Employment of a staff member specially skilled in curriculum development.
			c. Establishment of a Research Coordinating Unit.
			d. (Other)_____

_____
(Please describe)

5. A) If any of your staff members did attend curriculum institutes, please answer the following questions:

1) Were there observable consequences with respect to the contributions of such staff members in the following areas of curriculum development in your schools?

Yes	No		
[]	[]		
___	___	a.	Improved teaching methods
___	___	b.	Systems for effecting curriculum change
___	___	c.	Follow-up procedures
___	___	d.	(Other)_____

_____
(Please describe)

2) If possible, will you continue to send staff members to such institutes? Yes_____ No_____

B) If your staff members did not attend a curriculum institute or workshop, please answer the following questions:

1) Indicate the major reason for non-attendance:_____

_____

_____

2) Indicate the nature of curriculum institutes or workshops you would like to have your staff members attend. (Suggest topic, length of institute, types of experience, etc.)

_____ _____

_____

_____

Letter to Participant

Dear

As we stated in our February 19, 1969 letter to you, Oregon State University is making a study of the effectiveness of the institute on curriculum development that you attended at this institution during the summer of 1967. The guide it published may have been made on methods and procedures used by both the participants in the institute and those with whom they work.

Curriculum development is a major part of a good vocational education program. Any future institutes conducted for purposes similar to the one you attended must be designed for the utmost benefit to participants and vocational education. Your considered response to our questions will help us make the institutes of the future responsive to the professional needs we all know.

In addition to learning what success you may have had in using your experience at the institute and the curriculum guide the institute produced, we need your appraisal of the effectiveness of the institute as a method for stimulating improved curriculum development.

Your reflections upon the institute after almost two years of time will be most helpful.

Sincerely,

Henry A. Ten Pas
Director
Division of Vocational, Adult
and Community College Education

2

PARTICIPANT
QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____

SCHOOL_____

PLACE_____

1. Since your attendance at the 1967 institute, have you had responsibilities for vocational education curriculum development in any of the indicated agencies? (If more than one, please indicate.) (Advisory responsibility is consultative only; direct-assigned indicates responsibility for developing curriculum in the agency.

   Title of position_____

HAD RESPONSIBILITY		EXTENT OF RESPONSIBILITY						AGENCY SERVED
YES	NO	ADVISORY ONLY			ASSIGNED-DIRECT			
		VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH	VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH	
								UNIVERSITY
								STATE DEPT. OF ED.
								COMMUNITY COLLEGE
								VOC. TECH SCHOOL POST SECONDARY
								SECONDARY
								RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT

2. Did you use the guide developed by the institute in your curriculum activities to:

	EXTENT YOU USED GUIDE				
	Yes	No	Little	Some	Much
a. instruct and guide others on your staff?					
b. guide and instruct others outside staff?					
c. development procedures for your institution?					
d. development curriculum plans for other institutions?					

3. If you held general meetings to explain the use and value of the institute's guide with persons other than indicated in question, please describe this use.

	EXTENT YOU USED GUIDE				
	Yes	No	Little	Some	Much
a. education groups?					
b. community groups?					
c. vocational education groups only?					
d. advisory committees?					

4. 1) Check the groups listed below with whom you have discussed your experiences at the institute and the curriculum guide which was a product.
   2) Estimate the number of sessions with each group.
   3) Estimate the number of persons who attended these sessions.
   4) Estimate the degree of acceptance of methods recommended in the guide.

1 = no interest
3 = moderate interest
5 = active interest

Yes	No		How many sessions?	How many attended?	Degree of acceptance of methods in guide 1	3	5
[]	[]	American Vocational Ass'n	____	____			
[]	[]	State Voc-Ed Ass'n	____	____			
[]	[]	Teacher Training (University)	____	____			
[]	[]	Teacher Convention	____	____			
[]	[]	In-service training of teachers	____	____			
[]	[]	Staff training	____	____			
[]	[]	Research Coord. Unit Personnel	____	____			
[]	[]	Workshops	____	____			
[]	[]	Advisory Groups	____	____			

Yes	No		How many sessions?	How many attended?	Acceptance 1	3	5
[]	[]	Service Groups	____	____			
[]	[]	Student Groups	____	____			
[]	[]	Administrators	____	____			
[]	[]	School Boards	____	____			
[]	[]	(Others)	____	____			
[]	[]		____	____			
[]	[]		____	____			

Yes No

[] [] Have you, (individually or with others) prepared a curriculum guide, or other similar materials, for use by staff members of schools, school systems, or college programs?

a. 1) Give date of publication of materials

_____
month year

2) Send a copy of guide or materials to Oregon State University.

5. How do you rate the significance of the following in influencing those changes in curriculum development which you can relate to the institute and its guide?

a. How do you rate the guide produced at the institute in terms of:

1) Its ability to promote its ideas about curriculum development?

[] highly successful

[] mocerately successful

[] not successful

2) Its usefulness by persons who have not attended the instiute?

[] much used

[] seldom used

[] not used

3) Its value in improving curriculum and instruction?

[] much value

[] little value

[] no value

b. How do you evluate your own efforts to promote the methods developed in the guide?

[] much success

[] little success

[] no success

c. To what extent did your efforts result in changes in curriculum development?

[] many changes

[] some changes

[] no changes

d. To what extent did changes in curriculum development result from your work with others?

[] many changes

[] some changes

[] no changes

6. Would you attend another institute to continue the kind of work in curriculum development methods developed in the 1967 institute?

____a) yes
____b) no, but would recommend attendance by others.
____c) no, would not recommend it to others. Please state reason for dissatisfaction below:

_____

_____

_____

Yes No
[] [] Would you attend an institute if organized around a different topic? If yes,_____
(Please identify topic)

What is your recommendation about the length of an institute?
____less than one week
____one week
____two weeks
____more than two weeks

7. What is your present evluation of the decision model presented in the guide as a means for the development of curriculum for vocational education?

____a. very helpful
____b. moderately helpful
____c. not helpful

How does your present evaluation of the decision model compare with your judgment at the end of the institute?

____a. I value it more highly
____b. I value it less highly
____c. no change

Letter to Supervisor
of Participant

Dear

During the summer of 1967 the Oregon State University held an institute for the preparation of vocational educators in curriculum development.
, from your agency was your appointed participant.

We are now making a follow-up study to determine the institute's effectiveness in accomplishing its purpose of effecting curriculum change in vocational education. The results of this study will be very important to future institutes since the information gained will be used to make them as directly responsive to current problems as possible.

Your cooperation, by answering our questions, is important to our study. You are in a position to help us directly measure the effect the 1967 institute has had in your agency and its work.

Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire as promptly as possible. If we can improve workshops and institutes, you and vocational education will be better served.

Thank you and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Henry A. Ten Pas
Director
Division of Vocational, Adult
and Community College Education

SUPERVISOR OF PARTICIPANT

Your participant in the institute was _____.
He will be referred to as "the participant" in the questions.

1. Following the time of the 1967 institute, did the participant have responsibilities in vocational education curriculum development for any of the indicated agencies? (If more than one, please indicate. Advisory reponsibility is consultative only; direct-assigned indicates responsibility for developing curriculum in the agency.)

   Title of position_____

HAD RESPONSIBILITY		EXTENT OF RESPONSIBILITY						AGENCY SERVED
YES	NO	ADVISORY ONLY			ASSIGNED DIRECT			
		VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH	VERY LITTLE	SOME	VERY MUCH	
								UNIVERSITY
								STATE DEPT. OF ED.
								COMMUNITY COLLEGE
								VOC. TECH SCHOOL POST SECONDARY
								SECONDARY
								RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT

2. To your knowledge, has the participant used the guide for curriculum development in vocational education, which the summer 1967 institute developed, in his curriculum development activities to:

	EXTENT HE USED GUIDE				
	Yes	No	Low	High	Total
a. instruct and guide others on your staff					
b. guide or instruct others outside staff					
c. develop instructions for your institution					
d. develop plans for other institution					

3. If the participant held general meetings to explain the use and value of the institute's guide with persons other than you indicated in question No. 1, please describe this use:

	EXTENT HE USED GUIDE				
	Yes	No	Low	High	Total
a. education groups?					
b. community groups?					
c. vocational education group only?					
d. advisory committees?					

4. From your knowledge of the participant's activities in curriculum development please indicate your impressions of his effect with the following listed groups:

Do you believe the participant is now doing work with the listed groups differently than he did before attendance at the institute where he helped develop the guide for curriculum development?

Has there been a change in methods or procedures used by the group that you can attribute to the participant's attending the institute?

Estimate the number of sessions with each group. Estimate the number of persons who attended these sessions. Estimate the degree of acceptance of methods recommended in the guide.

1 = no interest
3 = moderate interest
5 = active interest

Yes	No		How many sessions?	How many attended?	Degree of acceptance of methods in guide 1	3	5
[]	[]	American Vocational Association	____	____			
[]	[]	State Voc-Ed Ass'n.	____	____			
[]	[]	Teacher training (Universities)	____	____			
[]	[]	Teacher Convention	____	____			
[]	[]	In-service training of teachers	____	____			
[]	[]	Staff training	____	____			

Yes	No		How many sessions?	How many attended?	Acceptance 1	3	5
[]	[]	Research Coordinating Unit Personnel	____	____			
[]	[]	Workshops	____	____			
[]	[]	Advisory groups	____	____			
[]	[]	Service groups	____	____			
[]	[]	Student groups	____	____			
[]	[]	Administrators	____	____			
[]	[]	School board	____	____			
[]	[]	Others	____	____			
[]	[]		____	____			
[]	[]		____	____			

Yes No

[] [] Have you, (individually or with others) prepared a curriculum guide or other similar materials for use by staff members of schools, school systems, or college programs?

a. 1) Give date of publication of materials_____
month year

2) Send a copy of guide or materials to Oregon State University

5. How do you rate the significance of the following in influencing those changes in curriculum development which you can relate to the institute and its guide?

a. How do you rate the guide produced at the institute in terms of:

1) its ability to promote its ideas about curriculum development?

[] highly successful

[] moderately successful

[] not successful

2) its usefulness by persons who had not attended the institute?

[] much used

[] seldom used

[] not used

3) its value in improving curriculum and instructions?

[] much value

[] little value

[] no value

b. How do you evaluate participant's efforts to promote the methods developed in the guide?

[] much success

[] some success

[] little success

c. To what extent did the participant's efforts result in changes in curriculum development?

[] many changes

[] some changes

[] no changes

6. Would you send a person to another institute to follow-up the one the participant attended in 1967 for further curriculum development methods?

____a. yes
____b. no, but would recommend attendance by others
____c. no, would not recommend it to others. Please state reason for dissatisfaction:

_____

_____

_____

REFERENCES

1. Guide for Vocational Education Curriculum Development,

   Project No. 7-0497
   T. A. Ryan, Institute Director, July 1967
   Oregon State University
   Corvallis, Oregon 97331

2. Summer Institute to Prepare Vocational Educators in Curriculum Development,

   Project No. 7-0497
   T. A. Ryan, July 1968
   Oregon State University
   Corvallis, Oregon 97331

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Guide for Vocational Education Curriculum Development,

   Project No. 7-0497
   T. A. Ryan, Institute Director
   July, 1967
   Oregon State University
   Corvallis, Oregon 97331

2. Summer Institute to Prepare Vocational Educators in Curriculum Development,

   Project No. 7-0497
   T. A. Ryan, July 1968
   Oregon State University
   Corvallis, Oregon 97331